

From: Yelensky, Erica [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA8D830A3444480EABD236AA84FFCE37-EYELENSK]
Sent: 4/16/2019 10:29:43 PM
To: Louis, Gail [Louis.Gail@epa.gov]; Hagler, Tom [Hagler.Tom@epa.gov]
Subject: SMBNEP eSurvey responses
Attachments: Santa Monica Bay NEP esurvey March 2019.pdf

Gail and Tom,

Attached are the results of the SMBNEP esurvey. Pls see slides 43 and 47 for SWRCB responses to the following questions (text also included below).

- Are there elements of the current governance structure that could be modified for improved performance?
- Could you suggest any other changes to the current governance structure or suggestions for future governance?

Slide 43 - Are there elements of the current governance structure that could be modified for improved performance?

Several elements of the current structure can be modified and improved, including the following: 1). The Chair and Executive Committee should provide a stronger leadership in guiding SMBNEP's work priorities and the agenda of the SMBRC, and play a more active role in raising more funding sources to support CCMP implementation. The improvement of the EC function can be benefitted by regular participation of EC meetings by U.S. EPA and SWRCB representatives, the two primary sponsors of the SMBNEP, adding the two agencies as members of the EC if necessary.

2). The current structure of the Watershed Advisory Council should be revamped as it is no longer productive and effective in soliciting input from, and communicating with the general public. It is also to a large degree duplicative of the public involvement function already built into the structure of the Governing Board and the Board meetings. In addition, the large and overlapping membership of the WAC with the Governing Board causes a lot of confusion and create unnecessary administrative burden on staff and all participating members. Potential alternatives to the current WAC structure include a new Public Advisory or Outreach Committee set up by the Governing Board, similar to the

structure of the current TAC, or annual or regular public workshop set up to present information on SMBNEP activities and to solicit public input. The current role of the WAC is to provide input to the GB on restoration in the watershed. This could be better accomplished by setting aside time for the public to engage with the GB during regularly scheduled meetings. The Watershed Stakeholder Group could be open to any stakeholders/members of the public to provide input.

3). The SMBRC-TBF partnership can be further improved and strengthened by amendments to the current MOU and MOA to further clarify the roles and responsibilities of each entity, including the designation and roles and responsibilities of the SMBNEP Director.

4). Develop special committees appointed by GB to:

- (1) engage the legislature and advocate for funding allocations;
- (2) identify potential funding sources for grants coordinate fundraising activities,
- (3) conduct public outreach, engage with the public on disseminating information and informing them of opportunities to engage.

5) All governing documents including, but are not limited to the SMBRC MOU, the SMBRA MOU, the MOA between the SMBRC and TBF should be reviewed and brought up-to-date at the end of this process.

Slide 47-Could you suggest any other changes to the current governance structure or suggestions for future governance?

Review frequency of meetings and coordinate schedules. Reduce frequency of meetings, but perhaps lengthen the meeting time. Schedule them quarterly with key objectives at each meeting (e.g., reviewing and discussing draft CCMP and establishing priorities for annual workplan at one meeting, approving CCMP). • Consider adding a Watershed Outreach Council. Appointed by GB and include the members of GB. Key roles, outreach to legislature for funding, ID other potential funding sources (e.g., existing restoration project grants), opportunities to coordinate on projects (e.g., STORMS, CECs), stakeholder outreach-keeping the public/stakeholders engaged, active and disseminate Commission/NEP products and activities. • Governance document needs to incorporate considerations for climate change and building climate resiliency • Identify ways to keep the

governance pieces such as the governing board current and relevant. Also need to consider ways to keep public interest, regain public interest to improve ability to leverage resources. For example, consider integrating social media in the portions related to public outreach. Some items may not be appropriate to include in MOU, but should be included in the discussions to incorporate as appropriate.

- Clarify roles and responsibilities, meeting frequency, etc in MOU
- Review schedules given staff resources
- Need to build in enough time and emphasize the importance of people reading the meeting materials in advance and coming prepared to discuss at meetings.
- Investigate utility in JPA, not sure what the role is or could be.